



# **2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education**

*Draft Implementation Plan*

**October 2004**



## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Funding for Student Success .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Allocating Student Enrollments .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Increasing the Number of Degrees in High-demand Fields .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Keeping College Tuition Affordable and Predictable.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Promoting Opportunity Through Student Financial Assistance .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Meeting Regional and Statewide Higher Education Needs .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Helping Transfer Students Earn Bachelor’s Degrees .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Helping Students Make the Transition to College .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Accountability for Student Success.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Measuring Student Success with an Improved Data System .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Reducing Barriers for Non-traditional Students.....</b>	<b>41</b>





**October 2004**

## **Funding for Student Success**

### **Policy Proposal**

In the strategic master plan, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) set clear and measurable goals that focus on outcomes rather than inputs alone. However, the current state funding system for higher education is based on enrollments (inputs) rather than recognizing positive achievements like student success (outcomes). To reinforce an outcome-based approach, the board proposes the state develop a new funding method to reward public colleges and universities for student success. Success may be defined in many ways, but the central concept is degree or program completion. The concept of funding success represents a significant change in conducting business and will take time to plan and implement.

During 2005-07, the HECB will lay the groundwork to support a change in the funding mechanism. The board proposes that higher education funding be apportioned on the basis of enrollment during 2005-07, but that the funding system be transformed beginning with the 2007-09 biennium. The board will collaborate with the state higher education community and the legislative and executive branches of state government in designing a new funding methodology and an action plan to put it in place.

Any new funding methodology must recognize the differences among the institutions, so the board believes the state should discuss with the individual colleges and universities the nature and expected level of student success that should be addressed in an outcomes-based financing system.

There are a number of ways a funding-for-success system could be implemented:

- Performance contracts that involve a formal contract between the state and an institution that spells out the obligations of both parties – what outcomes will be delivered by the institution and what resources will be provided by the state to help achieve those outcomes.
- Budget provisos that would provide the legislative expectations of an institution in terms of degrees and performance targets rather than enrollment levels. Currently, the most important performance measure of an institution is whether it met or exceeded the full-time equivalent enrollment target set by the legislature.

- Calculating enrollment levels at the time of course completion rather than on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of classes. Under this approach, student enrollment would be counted for state funding purposes only if students completed a course, not if they just enrolled in a course.
- The letting of high-demand enrollment contracts could be modified from the current practice of selecting high-demand programs that focus on enrollments to instead focus on results – while the HECB’s high-demand budget request was presented in terms of expanding enrollments, the strategic master plan goal for high-demand is stated in terms of program completions.

While the board’s budget recommendations center on expanding enrollments, these enrollment recommendations are directly based on meeting the board’s degree and performance target goals. For example, the board’s goal for increasing the number of bachelor’s degrees earned at public institutions has a target by the end of the 2005-07 biennium that is roughly 2,100 degrees higher than what could be expected from current budgeted undergraduate levels. The board has assumed that it will take around 360,000 student credit hours of educational activity or 8,000 full-time equivalent students to produce these degrees (at 3.89 FTE students per bachelor’s degree). The recommended funding level is \$6,303 per FTE student or \$24,500 per bachelor’s degree.

There is a lag between when students are enrolled and degrees are awarded. The implementation of funding for success will require some thought during the 2005-07 biennium to sort out the best way of proceeding.

### **Recommended Actions**

- **Following the conclusion of the 2005 legislative session**, the HECB will work with the governor’s office, legislative fiscal committees and the higher education institutions to gather the data and input needed to develop options for creating an outcomes-based funding system.
- **By December 2005, the HECB will report** to the legislature and governor on the options identified for creating a new funding system, including a “preferred option” recommended by the board. This report will identify any statutes that would need to be revised to support a new financing approach. The board will also include in its budget guidelines for the 2007-09 biennium (which are distributed in December of odd-numbered years) any institutional requirements related to development of a new funding mechanism.
- **By the end of the 2006 session**, legislation will be adopted to implement any necessary statutory changes.

- **In September 2006**, the higher education institutions will include with their 2007-09 operating budget proposals any information requested under the HECB budget guidelines related to the new funding system.
- **By November 1, 2006, the HECB** will make its 2007-09 operating budget recommendations, which will incorporate funding of higher education based on success.
- **The new funding methodology will be implemented** by the legislature and governor in the 2007-09 state operating budget.

### **Performance Measures**

- Actual performance measures for measuring student success would be identified on the basis of the specific funding methodology adopted by the legislature and governor. Performance measures would be proposed by the HECB, in consultation with the higher education institutions, in the December 2005 report.

### **Estimated Costs**

- The estimated costs of implementing a “funding for student success” system are indeterminate.
- It is expected that an agreement to produce the same outputs as currently would cost no less than is currently being spent. It is known that current funding is significantly less than the amounts received by similar institutions in other states.
- If student successes are to be increased, additional resources will be called for. Under the state’s current funding system, the primary sources of these resources are state general funds and tuition revenue.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The 2004 supplemental operating budget called for the governor’s office, with assistance from the HECB, to work with the University of Washington and Washington State University to create a prototype of a research university performance contract. The prototype is to (a) reflect statewide goals and priorities of the legislature; (b) contain goals and commitments from both the institutions and the state; (c) include quantifiable performance measures and benchmarks; (d) identify specific resources needed to implement the contract; and (e) include any other information deemed pertinent by the governor. By December 1, 2004, the governor is to submit to the legislature the prototype performance contract along with any implementing legislation.



## **Allocating Student Enrollments**

### **Policy Proposal**

The board needs to make specific enrollment allocation recommendations to carry out the intent of the 2004 master plan.

The shape and size of the state's higher education system is of primary concern for decision-makers looking to optimize state resources.

Issues that will influence discussions of the "shape and size" of the system and the board's specific enrollment recommendations include (a) the division of resources among the public two-year and four-year colleges and universities; (b) the split of new resources and enrollments among the main campuses, branch campuses, and off-site learning centers; (c) the role of private colleges and universities in meeting the state's need for additional higher education enrollment capacity; (d) regional economic, educational, and programmatic needs; and (e) methods of program delivery, such as traditional instruction, 2+2 programs for transfer students, and technology-enhanced distance learning.

### **Recommended Actions**

- Six action steps are outlined in the master plan to address a wide range of enrollment allocation policy questions. All require data collection, analysis, and cost projections.
- The board's proposals for enrollment allocation and funding will be included in the biennial higher education recommendations to the governor and legislature. On October 21, the HECB is scheduled to adopt recommendations to the governor for 2005-07. These will be based on how the requests align with the board's budget priorities, the missions of the institutions, and the goals of the statewide strategic master plan. The recommendations will address the first biennium objectives of the master plan.
- Tuition, financial aid, and the costs of other proposals are addressed in other implementation plans and cost estimates.

### **Performance Measures**

- To determine whether resources are allocated in an optimal manner will require the state to quantify (a) the actual number of degrees produced; (b) the average number of student credit hours attempted per degree by sector; (c) the cost per student credit hour in each sector of the state system; and (d) the difference between budgeted and actual enrollments at the public institutions.

## **Estimated Costs**

- Increasing enrollments to meet the board's degree goals will require additional state resources. The exact amount will depend on how many additional students are needed and the cost per student.
- Costs for 2005-07 will be presented in the board's 2005-07 budget recommendations.

## **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The 2004 supplemental operating budget directed the HECB to develop a simulation model to allow for analysis of the impacts and costs of various higher education policy alternatives. The policy model is to examine the interaction between higher education demand, funding resources, and institutional capacity. This work is due to be completed by December 15, 2004.
- This model will be useful in answering a number of the questions posed in the strategic master plan proposal to allocate student enrollments and will be used to estimate the fiscal impacts of various policy options in future biennia.

## **Increasing the Number of Degrees in High-demand Fields**

### **Policy Proposal**

In the master plan, the board has established a target of increasing by 300 per year the number of students who earn degrees and are prepared for work in high-demand fields. This rate of increase would yield a cumulative total of 1,500 additional high-demand degrees per year by 2010.

### **Recommended Actions**

#### **1. Identification of high-demand fields (short-term – 2005-07 biennium).**

- Since competitive high-demand enrollment funding began in 1999, eligible programs have been identified in two ways. The legislature and governor have identified in the state operating budget a number of academic fields in which (a) student enrollment applications exceed available positions and (b) employers are unable to find enough skilled graduates to fill available or forecast job openings.
- Colleges have been permitted to propose certain additional fields for high-demand designation (and for enriched funding). The HECB has required supporting information to justify this designation for the programs being proposed.
- In the short-term, this approach should continue.

#### **2. Identification of high-demand fields (long-term – 2007-09 biennium and beyond).**

- The HECB is identifying the organizations whose information and participation will be required. A work group will be convened by December 2004.
- The work group will develop a list of high-demand fields for the 2007-09 biennium by June 2006. In future years, the list of eligible programs will be included with the biennial HECB budget recommendations for higher education.
- The HECB would continue to permit institutions to document in their funding proposals additional academic fields that offer unique regional student and employer demand.
- The competitive bid process for selecting specific programs for funding would continue.

### 3. Legislative funding of high-demand enrollment slots.

- The HECB and SBCTC have submitted budget requests for 2005-07 to continue high-demand enrollment funding. In addition, it is expected that funding for existing high-demand grant programs will be continued in institutional base budgets.

#### Performance Measures

- Change in the number of degrees/certificates earned and/or program completions in high-demand fields. (**Note:** There will be a time lag between the initial funding, the addition of students, and the change in the number of degrees/certificates.)
- Change in enrollments in high-demand fields.
- State appropriations for high-demand programs.

#### Estimated Costs

- Estimated costs for the next three biennia are addressed on the following page.
  - **2005-07:** \$30 million in new appropriations and \$0 in carry-forward costs (treating this proposal as a new program and not a continuation of the existing program).
  - **2007-09:** \$30 million in new appropriations and \$40 million in carry-forward costs.
  - **2009-11:** \$30 million in new appropriations and \$80 million in carry-forward costs.

**Note:** Funds to continue the high-demand projects initiated during 2003-05 would be included in institutions' base budgets in future biennia.

- Appropriations during the 2005-07 biennium would be made to the HECB and the SBCTC. These would consist of \$10 million in the first year of the biennium and \$20 million in the second year (to continue the initial first-year projects and begin a new second year set of projects).
- In future biennia, these projects' ongoing costs would be carried forward in the institutional base budgets and new rounds of projects would be started.

#### Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action

- Since 1999, the HECB has received three separate appropriations to conduct competitive grant programs to expand and create new academic programs in fields where there is unmet student enrollment demand and where employers are having difficulty finding

skilled graduates. Funds and enrollment slots have been targeted to programs in computer sciences and technology fields, health care, teacher training, and in fields that offer regional economic development opportunities.

- The initial appropriation to the HECB, in the 1999-01 biennium, was for grants to public two-year and four-year colleges and universities. However, subsequent appropriations to the HECB have been for only four-year institutions. The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges has administered grants to the public two-year colleges. In FY04, \$9 million was granted for 1,366 FTE students; in FY05, \$19 million was granted for 2,436 FTE students.
- The HECB has begun to implement a provision of House Bill 3103 (Sec. 9) that calls for a comprehensive and ongoing assessment process to analyze the need for additional degrees and programs. This project will provide significant information about which academic fields are expected to be in demand from students and employers in the future.

### High Demand Funding Proposal and Outcomes

Dollars in Millions

	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Grants to HECB, SBCTC and/or institutions	\$10	\$20	\$10	\$20	\$10	\$20
"Carryforward" appropriations to institutions and/or SBCTC			\$20	\$20	\$40	\$40
Total GF-S	\$10	\$20	\$30	\$40	\$50	\$60
<b>Biennial Total</b>		<b>\$30</b>		<b>\$70</b>		<b>\$110</b>
Average state cost per FTE	\$10,000					
FTEs in high-demand programs	1,000	2,000	3,000	4,000	5,000	6,000
<b>Completers</b>		<b>600</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,800</b>



## **Keeping College Tuition Affordable and Predictable**

### **Policy Proposal**

In the short term, tuition and fees should not increase by more than 31 percent during any consecutive four-year period (average increases of 7 percent compounded). Annual tuition increases should be spread as evenly as possible over this four-year period, and no annual increase should exceed 10 percent.

To develop a long-term tuition policy, the board will complete a feasibility analysis of alternative tuition policies and make a recommendation to the legislature and governor for consideration during the 2006 legislative session.

### **Recommended Actions**

#### **1. The HECB recommends the legislature and governor adopt this tuition policy beginning with the 2005-06 academic year.**

- Understanding that budget constraints may affect the ability and willingness of the legislature to limit tuition increases to 7 percent annually, a certain amount of flexibility must be involved. When circumstances dictate, tuition could increase by up to 10 percent in any one year. The initial four-year period under this proposal would commence with the 2005-06 academic year.

### **Performance Measures**

- Tuition increases over four consecutive years, beginning with 2005-06.
- No annual tuition increases over 10 percent are approved in any one year.
- Changes in per-student appropriations to colleges and universities.
- Changes in per-student appropriations for financial aid.

**Note:** The latter two measures will help to evaluate the interaction between tuition policy and state funding.

### **Estimated Costs and/or Revenues**

- There are no direct costs to the HECB or the state associated with putting this short-term policy in place.

- Tuition rates always affect institutional revenues, but it is not possible to predict the impact of this proposal at this time.
- Likewise, any tuition increase has financial aid implications. As such, the amount of general funds needed to maintain existing and historic service levels for financial aid programs will increase.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- In 2003, the legislature and governor enacted Senate Bill 5448, which established parameters for tuition-setting through the 2008-09 academic year.
- Under this legislation, the legislature retained the authority to set tuition rates for resident undergraduate students. Unrestricted authority to set tuition rates for all other groups of students was granted to the individual four-year institutions and the SBCTC on behalf of two-year colleges.

### **2. By April 2005, the HECB will establish an advisory committee to advise the board on elements of the feasibility analysis and will develop a timetable to complete the study by October 2005.**

- At a minimum, the analysis will consider (a) a sliding scale for tuition charges linked to students' ability to pay; (b) alternatives through which the state can maintain its commitment to purchasers of GET tuition units; (c) protect the long-term sustainability health of the program; and (d) policy implications of the tuition elements of performance contracts between the state and individual colleges and universities.

### **Performance Measures**

- Completion of the study by October 2005.
- Final report and recommendations for legislative action prior to 2006 legislative session.

### **Estimated Costs**

- The feasibility analysis will be conducted within existing resources.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The intent section of Senate Bill 5448 indicated that the state would use data from the six-year policy to identify options for long-term higher education funding, including state general fund support and tuition and financial aid sources.

## Promoting Opportunity Through Student Financial Assistance

### Policy Proposal

**Expanding student financial aid:** To help financially needy students meet the rising costs of a college education, the state should expand several state financial aid and scholarship programs and create a new pilot program to aid adults who attend college part-time while working full-time.

### Recommended Actions

#### 1. State Need Grant

- The state should provide grants equal to 100 percent of tuition to students with family incomes at 65 percent of the state's median, and serve all students eligible for the grant. The HECB is requesting funding in the 2005-07 state operating budget to increase the income service level from the current 55 percent of median family income to 65 percent and to provide grants to all eligible students equal to 100 percent of tuition at public colleges and universities.

### Performance Measures

- 100 percent of students with family incomes at or below 65 percent of the state's median would receive a State Need Grant equal to 100 percent of the cost of tuition at a public institution.

### Estimated Costs

- **2005-2007** – \$125.8 million
- **2007-2009** – \$50.6 million
- **2009-2011** – \$59.5 million

**Note:** The estimate for 2005-07 reflects the cost of moving from the current service levels to the board's goals of 65 percent of MFI and 100 percent of public tuition. The estimates for all three biennia assume annual enrollment increases and annual 7 percent tuition increases.

### Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action

- A financial aid work group convenes periodically to advise HECB staff on program policy and administration.

## **2. State Work Study – Placement opportunities in high-demand fields**

- The state should increase funding for the State Work Study program to provide students with additional job opportunities in high-demand fields. Elsewhere in the master plan, the HECB recommends expansion of the state's high-demand enrollment funding. To improve that program, the HECB will establish criteria for identifying high-demand fields on an ongoing basis. This proposal would provide funds to create job placements for needy students within these targeted fields. Funds would be distributed in response to institution proposals and would supplement colleges' base state work study allocations.

### **Performance Measures**

- The number of students who graduate with work experience in high-demand fields related to the subject of their majors.

### **Estimated Costs**

- **2005-2007** – \$600,000

**Note:** Appropriations in future biennia would increase in proportion to funded high-demand enrollments.

## **3. State Work Study – Restore historic service level**

- The state should increase work study appropriations to restore the number of students served to the program's historic level of 1 in 14 needy students. The board also recommends increases to maintain the student award at approximately 15 percent of each student's financial need throughout the next three biennia.

### **Performance Measures**

- The percentage of needy students who receive a State Work Study grant.

### **Estimated Costs**

- **2005-2007** – \$8.9 million
- **2007-2009** – \$4.4 million
- **2009-2011** – \$4.9 million

**Note:** The estimate for 2005-07 reflects the cost of restoring the service level of the program to its historic service level of 1 in 14 needy students. The estimates for all three biennia assume annual enrollment increases, annual tuition increases of 7 percent, and annual inflation adjustments to all other educational costs.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The State Work Study program has a standing advisory committee.

### **4. Educational Opportunity Grant – Increase participation**

- The EOG program is the state's only targeted financial aid initiative specifically designed to increase the number of students who earn bachelor's degrees. The HECB is requesting \$1.5 million in the 2005-07 state operating budget to increase the number of participating students by 50 percent and to keep pace with enrollment growth in future biennia.

### **Performance Measures**

- Increase in the number of transfer students completing baccalaureate degrees.
- Time to degree will be less for EOG recipients than for similar students who do not receive the grant.
- The number of credits completed per academic year by EOG recipients will be greater than that of similar students who do not receive the grant.

### **Estimated Costs**

- **2005-2007** – \$1.5 million
- **2007-2009** – \$1.5 million
- **2009-2011** – \$1.5 million

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- Based on a HECB study, the EOG statute was amended in 2003 to (a) expand eligibility for the grant to previously excluded counties (those not served by a branch campus) and (b) allow students to use their grant at a branch campus. These changes, together with the goals of the Strategic Master Plan, have prompted HECB staff to create an ongoing outreach effort to ensure that eligible students and institutions fully understand the program and are provided an efficient means to apply.

### **5. Washington Promise Scholarship**

- Inadequate funding has prevented the Washington Promise Scholarship program from fulfilling its intent. To most effectively motivate middle and high school students to excel and prepare for college, the scholarship should be funded at the statutory maximum of two-year college tuition. The HECB has requested funds to increase awards to

100 percent of two-year college tuition in 2005-07. In future biennia, the state would need to increase grant amounts to reflect tuition increases.

### **Performance Measures**

- The educational loan debt of students receiving the Promise scholarship will be compared to that of needy students from similar family incomes who do not receive the scholarship.

### **Estimated Costs**

- **2005-2007** – \$20.4 million
- **2007-2009** – \$3.9 million
- **2009-2011** – \$4.4 million

**Note:** The 2005-07 estimate would raise the award amount to 100 percent of community and technical college tuition. The estimates for all three biennia assume a 7 percent annual increase in resident undergraduate tuition.

## **6. Washington Scholars and Washington Award for Vocational Excellence – Maintain value of awards**

- The state should fund these programs to maintain scholarship awards at the value of public tuition and fees, thereby rewarding academic and vocational excellence and motivating top-performing high school graduates to attend college in Washington State. Increased state appropriations are needed to keep pace with tuition increases.

### **Performance Measures**

- Percentage of tuition covered by Scholars and WAVE grants.

### **Estimated Costs**

#### Washington Scholars

- **2005-2007** – \$630,000
- **2007-2009** – \$547,500
- **2009-2011** – \$629,000

#### Washington Award for Vocational Excellence

- **2005-2007** – \$39,000
- **2007-2009** – \$183,000
- **2009-2011** – \$210,000

**Note:** These estimates assume resident undergraduate tuition increases of 7 percent per year.

## **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The Washington Scholars program is administered by the HECB in partnership with the Washington Principals Association. The Washington Award for Vocational Excellence is administered by the Washington Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, with the HECB acting as fiscal agent.

## **7. Financial Aid for Low-income Full-time Workers – New pilot program**

- A pilot grant program for low-income, full-time workers who attend college for five credits or fewer per term should be developed and tested in the 2005-07 biennium. If the pilot is successful, the state should consider developing an ongoing statewide program to serve this group of students.
- Interested institutions would apply to participate in the pilot, which would be operated by the HECB with assistance from an advisory committee. Participating students would receive grants equal to tuition, plus an allowance for books.
- The pilot program would run through June 2007. An evaluation would be presented to the Higher Education Coordinating Board by December 2007. At that point, the board would decide whether to request establishment of an ongoing program.

## **Recommended Actions**

- **State law provides the HECB** authority to develop pilot financial aid programs. Implementation would be contingent upon funding by the legislature. The board has requested \$2 million in the state operating budget to fund the pilot during 2005-07.
- **In winter 2005, the board's financial aid work group** will meet to advise the HECB on the structure of the project. The group will advise the HECB on (a) the number of colleges that should participate; (b) the content of the request for proposals; (c) how proposals should be evaluated; and (d) the level of funding that individual proposals should receive.
- **If funding is appropriated**, a request for proposals will be issued in July 2005.
- **The pilot project would operate** from fall 2005 through spring 2007.
- **By December 2007, a progress report** would be presented to the HECB, which would then decide whether to request legislation to establish an ongoing program.

## **Performance Measures**

- The success of the pilot project will be measured on the basis of the following outcomes:  
(a) the pilot will enable reasonable estimates of statewide demand for such an aid program and (b) the pilot program design will be evaluated and refined to ensure that students' training leads to career advancement as measured by the percent of increase in hourly wages.

## **Estimated Costs**

- **2005-2007** – \$2 million

**Note:** Funding in future biennia would depend on results of the pilot project.

## **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- An advisory group with representatives from colleges and universities, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, the Council of Presidents, and the Independent Colleges of Washington has advised the Higher Education Coordinating Board on program design and implementation.

## **Meeting Regional and Statewide Higher Education Needs**

### **Policy Proposal**

Washington's higher education system must be realigned and expanded to respond to regional and statewide economic needs and to achieve the board's goal for more students to attain associate, bachelor's, graduate, and professional degrees.

### **Recommended Actions**

**1. Provide a simulation model that allows state policy-makers to analyze the impact of various enrollment and funding options.**

- **By December 2004, the HECB** will provide a simulation model as directed in the 2004 supplemental budget to enable state policy-makers and others to analyze the impact of various enrollment and funding options.

### **Performance Measures**

- Presentation of simulation model to legislature and usefulness in policy considerations.

### **Estimated Costs**

- No new costs will be required beyond the \$100,000 provided in the 2004 supplemental operating budget.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The HECB staff has been working on the enrollment/funding simulation model in collaboration with the legislative fiscal committees and OFM since the conclusion of the 2004 legislative session.

**2. The HECB will present a reconfiguration plan to the governor and legislature, college and university governing boards, and other stakeholders. A collaborative process will examine opportunities to expand enrollment access for students, assess the need to revise the missions and services of existing institutions, and determine whether new colleges and universities are needed to meet regional and statewide needs.**

- **By December 2004, the HECB, with assistance from stakeholders,** will develop a comprehensive higher education planning process to include a methodology for state and regional assessments of student, employer, and community demand for higher education

at various levels and locations and assessing options to meet expanding higher education demand.

- **By March 2005, the HECB and higher education stakeholders** will assess options to expand higher education enrollment capacity in the state, including (a) expansion of regional comprehensive universities, (b) expansion and/or development of additional off-campus learning centers and distance learning, (c) branch campuses, (d) the transition of selected two-year colleges to baccalaureate institutions, (e) performance contracts between the state and public four-year institutions, and (f) the role of private colleges and universities, including in-state and out-of-state providers.
- **By March 2005, the HECB** will update its inventory of higher education resources, including locations, target populations served, enrollments, and programs offered at main and branch campuses and off-site learning centers.
- **By June 2005, the HECB**, with assistance from stakeholders, will develop guidelines for the planning and growth of off-campus centers, branch campuses, and transition of two-year to baccalaureate institutions.
- **By September 2005, the HECB** will present a final plan to the governor and legislature, college and university governing boards, and other interested parties.

### **Performance Measures**

- Dissemination of reconfiguration plan and reports.

### **Estimated Costs**

- No new costs will be required beyond the \$205,000 provided to the HECB in the 2004 supplemental budget to assist in statewide and regional needs assessments.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

Various groups have been meeting in 2004 to review the regional and statewide planning requirements of House Bill 3103 and House Bill 2707, both of which were enacted during the 2004 legislative session. The new statutes call for greater focus in planning for regional higher education needs in relationship to state and regional workforce needs, with a focus on how to expand the capacity of the higher education system.

- In summer 2004, the HECB developed guidelines to assist the University of Washington and Washington State University in developing the reports about their branch campuses required under House Bill 2707. The HECB will receive these reports in November 2004.

and will forward the reports, with the HECB's policy options, to the legislature and governor in January 2005.

- Discussions have begun within the higher education community and with members of the legislature to consider the implications of preserving the state's current "hourglass" structure – one that concentrates enrollment at the research universities and community and technical colleges – versus moving toward a "pyramid" structure – one that would focus enrollment growth at the regional comprehensive universities.

### **3. The HECB, with assistance from stakeholders, will complete the needs assessment process outlined in House Bill 3103.**

- **By December 2004, the HECB** will establish and staff an interagency work group to include representation from State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board. The work group will consult with the Council of Presidents and other stakeholders to develop criteria to be used to evaluate statewide and regional planning needs. The work group will report its findings to the respective boards during spring 2005.
- **By January 2005, the HECB, with assistance from stakeholders,** will identify the regions of the state that should be the focus of future data collection and planning initiatives. This process will rely, in part, on existing workforce development efforts to ensure that higher education expansion responds to regional and statewide economic opportunities.
- **By February 2005, the HECB, with assistance from stakeholders,** will review existing needs assessments; identify information gaps and the need for new assessments; and incorporate information on statewide and regional demand for higher education by students, employers, and communities. This information will distinguish between various levels of education (undergraduate, graduate, and professional) and geographic locations.
- **By February 2005, the HECB, with assistance from stakeholders,** will review recently conducted needs assessments from various sources and commission new state and regional needs assessments to guide program review and approvals with an emphasis on high-demand academic fields.
- **By June 2005, the HECB** will issue reports on state and regional needs assessments in three or four high-demand academic fields.

### **Performance Measures**

- Dissemination of plans and reports.

## **Estimated Costs**

- No new funds will be required during the 2003-05 biennium beyond the funds provided to the HECB in the 2004 supplemental operating budget. Additional funding may be required in the 2005-07 and 2007-09 biennia to assist with ongoing state and regional needs assessments.

## **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- HECB staff has been meeting with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to discuss projections of the labor market need for graduates with various levels of educational attainment.
- See earlier notes about activities surrounding the implementation of House Bill 3103 and House Bill 2707.

### **4. By July 2005, the HECB and the SBCTC will revise their current processes for approval of new degree programs at the four-year and two-year institutions to guide the development of new associate, baccalaureate, and graduate programs that meet the needs of students and employers and support the state's educational, civic, and economic goals.**

- **By December 2004, HECB staff** will meet with staff from the SBCTC and other stakeholders to receive feedback and consider options to revise program review processes and criteria for two- and four-year institutions related to statewide and regional planning needs. The HECB staff will report findings to the respective boards in Spring 2005.
- **By February 2005, the HECB staff**, in consultation with the provosts of the public baccalaureate institutions, will develop draft guidelines for program approval and assessment for the four-year institutions that reflect statewide and regional needs assessments.
- **By June 2005, the HECB and the SBCTC** will review and approve updated program review guidelines and notify the institutions within their jurisdictions of changes in the review processes.
- **By July 2005, the HECB and SBCTC** will implement revised program review policies, to accommodate strengthened focus on state and regional planning needs.

## **Performance Measures**

- HECB and SBCTC approval of revised guidelines for program approval.

## **Estimated Costs**

- This work will be accomplished within existing resources.

## **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The HECB staff is gathering information about the approval processes used in other states and is reviewing its current guidelines for approval of new degree programs at the public baccalaureate institutions.
- The four-year institutions' Council of Presidents has established a committee of instructional leaders to review new program planning and its relationship to enhanced state and regional planning. HECB staff will meet with this group in October 2004 to review issues related to statewide and regional planning, new program review guidelines, and the proposal for an interagency work group.



## Helping Transfer Students Earn Bachelor's Degrees

### Policy Proposal

The state needs a barrier-free transfer system to help community college transfer students earn bachelor's degrees at four-year colleges and universities as efficiently as possible.

Associate degree "pathways" that prepare students for particular majors at four-year colleges and universities would help students graduate without completing more credits than the number they need for their baccalaureate degree. Currently, all associate degrees require students to complete exactly 90 quarter-based credits at a community college. Yet students interested in some majors would be best prepared by completing more or less than 90 credits at a community college.

An existing statewide policy requires transfer students to complete 90 credits at a four-year college or university when they transfer with 90 credits from a two-year college. Elimination of this policy would allow students who complete associate degree pathways to graduate with exactly the credits they need to complete their bachelor's degree.

In addition, creation of a statewide on-line advising system like those developed in many other states would help students learn which two-year college courses can be transferred as "equivalent" to four-year college courses and which two-year college courses meet different degree requirements at four-year colleges and universities.

### Recommended Actions

#### **1. Develop associate degree pathways that focus on readiness for academic majors at four-year colleges and universities, as required by House Bill 2382.**

- **By June 2005**, new associate degree pathways will be developed for nursing, elementary education, and engineering. HECB staff will collect an inventory of existing associate degree pathways that prepare students for bachelor's degrees and the number of transfer students earning bachelor's degrees, by major. Additional pathways will be identified, primarily based on the volume of transfer students transferring into particular majors.
- **By December 2005**, the HECB will revise its program approval guidelines for four-year degrees to include a requirement that a corresponding associate degree pathway be identified to articulate with each newly proposed major.
- **By January 2005**, a progress report will be submitted to the legislature describing the progress of the work groups developing associate degree pathways.

- **By June 2006**, three additional high demand associate degree pathways will be developed.
- **By June 2007**, all four-year degrees that are in high demand by transfer students will be matched to corresponding associate degree pathways.

### **Performance Measures**

- Credits earned by transfer students in excess of those required for their bachelor's degree will decrease.

### **Estimated Costs**

- Costs will be absorbed by the HECB and institutions, as has been the case in past biennia.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- Work groups have been established to develop associate degree pathways for nursing, elementary education, and engineering.
- The Joint Access Oversight Group, a two-year/four-year college work group appointed by the state's academic leadership, formally supports the effort to develop major-specific associate degrees and is assisting HECB staff in identifying the need for additional pathways.

## **2. Revise existing Washington State transfer policy to delete the requirement that students transferring with associate degrees must complete an additional 90 quarter-based credits at a baccalaureate institution to earn a bachelor's degree.**

- **By November 2004, the HECB** will notify Washington colleges and universities that it is deleting the 90-credit requirement from the statewide transfer policy.

### **Performance Measures**

- Credits earned by transfer students in excess of those required for their bachelor's degree will decrease.

### **Estimated Costs**

- No costs have been identified.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The Joint Access Oversight Group supports the deletion of the current 90-credit requirement.

### **3. Develop a statewide online student advising system to facilitate transfer and degree planning.**

- **By January 2005, HECB staff** and a work group formed through House Bill 2382 will publish a report regarding options and prospective operating and maintenance costs for a statewide online student advising system.
- **By spring 2005**, if funding is approved by the legislature and governor, HECB staff will solicit bids from vendors to build the online advising system.
- **By July 2005, HECB staff** will select a vendor.
- **By January 2006, colleges and universities and the HECB staff** will work with the vendor to ensure course equivalency data is integrated into the statewide system; a student feedback tool is developed; and electronic transcripts are available.
- **By January 2008**, the online advising system will be fully operational, including a tool to facilitate faculty course equivalency decisions and, if applicable, links or interfaces to existing degree audit systems.

### **Performance Measures**

- Credits earned by transfer students in excess of those required for their bachelor's degree will decrease.
- Student surveys will be used to measure the system's effectiveness and ease of use.

### **Estimated Costs**

- Estimated costs, based on similar systems in other states, are \$1.1 million for development and first-year operation and \$550,000 annually in the future. This is a rough estimate based on several assumptions that are being explored by the work group. The actual cost could vary significantly from these initial estimates.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- During summer 2004, HECB staff convened a work group to consider requirements for an online advising system.
- During September and October 2004, HECB staff are leading the efforts of the work group to investigate different options, organizing meetings with vendors and experts from other states to investigate costs, barriers to implementation, and interfaces to existing systems.
- A survey of other state transfer policies and related systems is under way by HECB staff.
- The HECB has requested \$1.65 million for the advising system in its 2005-07 agency budget proposal.
- The two-year college system has developed a feasibility study for an online advising system specifically tailored to facilitate student transfer between two-year colleges and to advise students who seek an associate degree.
- The Joint Access Oversight Group supports the need for a statewide online advising system.

## Helping Students Make the Transition to College

### Policy Proposal

Students who aren't prepared for college often fail to achieve their goals. Educators must define and clearly communicate to K-12 parents and students what it means to be ready for college. Washington has established learning standards for students through the 10th grade. The state must now make sure classes for 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students adequately prepare them to succeed in college. And it must expand effective practices in preparing high school students for postsecondary study.

### Recommended Actions

#### **1. Define “college readiness” so that all high school students know the skills and abilities they need for success in their higher education career.**

- **In January 2005 and biennially thereafter, the HECB** reports to the legislature on efforts to reduce remediation and improve student transition from high school to college.
- **In January 2005, the HECB** will convene an advisory committee to develop a comprehensive definition of college readiness for Washington. The committee will meet quarterly and will include state policy-makers, K-12 and higher education administrators and faculty, and representatives of the private sector.
- **By August 2005, the advisory committee** will submit to the HECB recommended strategies for developing a definition of college readiness for Washington. The committee will take into account existing state and national college readiness standards. Strategies will address the need to align the state's definition of college readiness with existing school reform efforts.
- **In September 2005, the HECB** will issue a work plan for the state to adopt a college readiness definition.
- **By June 2006, the advisory committee and work groups** will publish draft definitions of college readiness in mathematics, science, English, social studies and world languages. Final definitions will be adopted by the HECB in December 2006 following public review.

### Performance Measures

- To be determined by cross-sector group.

## Estimated Costs

- The HECB will absorb the costs of convening the advisory group. HECB staff will estimate further costs for special projects after the board issues its work plan in September 2005.

## Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action

- Numerous state and national efforts to define college readiness are now underway or have been recently completed, including the **Transition Math Project**, a multi-sector initiative in Washington to develop and communicate readiness standards for college-level mathematics; the HECB's **Competency-Based Admissions Project**, which ended in 2001; **college-level writing competencies** under development by two-year college faculty; and the **American Diploma Project**, a national initiative to infuse rigorous academic standards and college and workplace preparation into high school curricula.
- Several organizations are engaged in outreach and advocacy about the importance of rigorous high school preparation for college. In Washington, state education agencies have joined private-sector groups like the Washington Roundtable and the Partnership for Learning to call for high standards and high achievement for all students.

## 2. Develop 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade learning outcomes that reflect the preparation required for college.

- **The HECB** will support the efforts of the **Superintendent of Public Instruction** to develop guidelines that identify the knowledge and abilities high school students must gain in grades 11 and 12 to be ready for college.

## Performance Measures

- Timely completion and dissemination of 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade preparation guidelines to public and private K-12 schools statewide.

## Estimated Costs

- The development of 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade learning outcomes is part of the Superintendent of Public Instruction's work plan and should not result in additional costs to the state. Long-term costs to the state for potential changes in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade curriculum and instruction could be significant, but it is impossible to estimate those costs at this time.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- A work group developing mathematics expectations for grades 11 and 12 has formed and will begin meeting after the Transitions Mathematics Project issues its college readiness standards in early 2005.
- OSPI has continued to develop and disseminate “grade-level expectations” for reading, mathematics, science, writing, health and fitness, and the arts through grade 10.

### **3. Promote effective practices that motivate and prepare students for college, allow them to earn college credits while still in high school, and make it easier for them to enroll at Washington colleges and universities.**

- **By December 2004, the HECB** will develop an online survey for higher education institutions, school districts, government agencies, and community-based organizations to identify and learn about high school-to-college transition initiatives – including dual credit, early awareness, tutoring, mentoring, teacher development, curriculum alignment, and parent advocacy programs.
- **By summer 2005, the HECB** will work with State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and public and private colleges and universities to identify and publicize the most effective practices in Washington that help students move successfully from high school to college.
- **By September 2005, the HECB** will publish a report on promising state and national college preparation practices, including dual-credit programs such as Running Start and College in the High School.
- **The HECB will biennially** provide progress reports on increasing dual-credit opportunities.

### **Performance Measures**

- An increase in the number of students who concurrently earn high school and college credit over 2003-04 levels.

### **Estimated Costs**

- The HECB will absorb the costs of developing the inventory of effective practices.
- Costs associated with developing additional dual-credit opportunities and college outreach programs will be identified and presented to the legislature with HECB analysis and recommendations.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges reports annually on enrollments, student progress, and state funding efficiencies related to the Running Start program, the state's largest dual-credit program.
- Several agencies, including the HECB, are collaborating to develop recommendations for reducing college remedial instruction. This group will make a report in December 2004.
- The Superintendent of Public Instruction administers a program to develop more Advanced Placement programs in the state's high schools.
- Programs such as GEAR UP, TRIO, Opportunity Scholars, Gates Achiever Scholars, and numerous campus-based programs promote early college awareness and readiness, support student planning and academic achievement, provide teacher development, or align high school and college curricula. These programs serve tens of thousands of Washington students in middle and high school.
- In January 2005, the HECB will address dual credit opportunities in a report to the legislature on high school-college transition issues as directed in House Bill 3103.

### **4. Communicate the requirements of a rigorous high school education that will lead to successful postsecondary study and improved curricular alignment and instruction.**

- **Following adoption of college readiness standards in 2006, the HECB** will develop and, assuming the availability of adequate resources, execute a communication strategy to inform students, parents, educators, and the public about the new standards.
- **Following the 2004-05 academic year, the HECB** will collaborate with colleges, universities and state agencies to improve feedback to high schools about the preparation for postsecondary study of their recent graduates. Strategies will include publicizing the percentage of students from each high school who enroll in postsecondary programs, persist in their studies, and require remedial instruction.
- **Beginning in January 2005, the HECB will work with the Superintendent of Public Instruction** and other interested parties to provide early college planning information to every middle and high school student in the state.

### **Performance Measures**

- Increased high school offerings of college-preparation curricula.

- Increased high school enrollment in college preparatory courses.
- Decreased remedial instruction for recent high school graduates.

### **Estimated Costs**

- The HECB will identify the costs and possible sources of funds to carry out the communication strategies.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- Several existing programs – GEAR UP, TRIO, and others – provide college planning information and support to middle and high school students.
- The state GEAR UP project has developed comprehensive college planning handbooks for students in the 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades.
- The Washington Council on High School-College Relations, a statewide organization of high school counselors and admissions officers, provides forums to improve students' transition from high school to college.
- The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges collects and reports remediation enrollments for the state's two-year colleges. Washington State University's Graduate Follow-Up Study provides remediation information about students at the state's four-year colleges.



## Accountability for Student Success

### Policy Proposal

Accountability is the backbone of a successful educational system, and Washington needs to redesign its current accountability system to measure progress toward statewide goals.

### Recommended Action

#### **1. Develop and implement a higher education accountability model that measures progress toward statewide goals.**

- **During winter 2005, HECB staff and a work group of representatives** from the public baccalaureate institutions will continue working to develop a set of common and institution-specific measures and targets and will review them with stakeholders. The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges will recommend measures and targets for the two-year college system that reflect the role and mission of the colleges.
- **During spring 2005, the HECB will review and adopt** the new accountability model and biennial performance targets for the public two-year and four-year colleges and universities.
- **By November 2005 and annually thereafter, the individual four-year colleges and universities and the SBCTC on behalf of the two-year system** will submit data to the HECB using the new measures and biennial plans to achieve improvements.
- **By June of each even-numbered year, in synch with the budget cycle, the HECB** will submit biennial plans and targets to the legislature and governor.

### Performance Measures

- Alignment of institutional measures and performance targets with state goals and core values outlined in the master plan.

### Estimated Costs

- The HECB and institutions will absorb all costs, as they have for several past biennia.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- Since 1997, Washington's higher education accountability system for the four-year institutions has included a total of six measures: four measures common to each institution (student retention, graduation efficiency for students who enroll as freshmen and for those who transfer, and five-year graduation rate), one measure for faculty productivity defined differently by each institution, and one institution-specific measure. The two-year college system has, in the past, reported on three common measures: transfer-readiness, adult literacy, and preparation for work.
- In 2003, the National Collaborative for Postsecondary Education Policy conducted a policy audit in Washington and found that "accountability is not systematically used to help focus attention on a limited number of state priorities."
- In February 2004, a work group with representatives from the public four-year and two-year institutions was formed at the request of the HECB to help develop a new higher education accountability model.
- House Bill 3103, effective June 2004, directed the HECB to establish an accountability monitoring and reporting system as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful, substantial progress toward the achievement of long-term performance goals in higher education.
- In September 2004, the accountability work group agreed that a new accountability model should include accountability measures for institutions, the state, and the statewide higher education system. Each public four-year college submitted proposed common and institution-specific measures, and the SBCTC redefined two of the three existing measures for the community and technical colleges.

## Measuring Student Success with an Improved Data System

### Policy Proposal

Detailed information about student success is essential to understand current trends and plan for future improvements. However, Washington, unlike many other states, lacks the coordinated data system needed by state policy-makers. The master plan calls for a student unit record data system to evaluate progress toward state goals and to identify and eliminate barriers to student success.

A statewide data system will allow HECB staff to address several problems and inaccuracies now caused by storing data separately at each institution. For example, not all colleges interpret data requests consistently or calculate “graduation efficiency” the same way, which leads to inaccurate comparisons between institutions. Also, graduation rates now categorize students as dropouts if they leave one four-year institution but graduate from another. Linking four-year unit record data statewide would enable HECB staff to count these students accurately as successful.

### Recommended Actions

**1. Develop a statewide four-year college student unit record data warehouse -- similar to the data warehouse used by the state’s community and technical colleges and those developed in many other states.**

- **By December 2004, Data Advisory Group** representatives and HECB staff will create a Memorandum of Understanding for sharing, protecting, and accessing data. (The Data Advisory Group, required by House Bill 3103 Sec. 12, is composed of representatives from public and independent higher education institutions and other state agencies.)
- **By March 2005, HECB staff**, in consultation with the Data Advisory Group, will select a model for collecting and standardizing data. The staff and advisory group also will identify policy questions and research projects to be completed during the following two years and submit the prioritized list to the HECB for approval. Some of the priorities will address routine information requests by the legislature, while others will focus on long-term projects that could, for example, track student progress over time and analyze how various factors affect their success.
- **By June 2005, public four-year colleges and universities** will begin submitting unit record data to the HECB. HECB staff will use the list of prioritized policy questions and projects to begin testing the data.

- **By September 2005, the Data Advisory Group and HECB staff** will have tested the data and developed prototype reports, ongoing routines, and standards for continuing to collect data on a regular basis.
- **By December 2005, HECB staff** will begin using the data on a regular basis to answer routine questions and to conduct research and produce reports according to the priorities set in March 2005. In consultation with the Data Advisory Group, the HECB staff will develop a report schedule for long-term research projects and a survey to determine whether users find the reports and data useful.
- **By March 2006, HECB staff and the Data Advisory Group** will revise the prioritized project list, seeking board approval as necessary. Users will be surveyed. The Data Advisory Group will continue to meet quarterly to review survey results, prioritize projects, and discuss and resolve any data issues or problems.

### **Performance Measures**

- Research priorities will be set in consultation with the Data Advisory Group and approved by the HECB.
- At least half of all legislative inquiries will be answered within 48 hours. (Currently, most inquiries require the HECB to survey each institution separately and can take weeks to complete.)
- Surveyed users will rate the reports and data provided by the HECB as useful, accurate, and timely.

### **Estimated Costs**

- First-year costs of \$317,500 for equipment and technical/project management staff. Ongoing annual costs of \$182,500 will include salaries for technical/project management staff.
- A minimal cost of 0.25 FTE at each public four-year institution is included in the costs listed above. Since each four-year institution now submits enrollment data on an ongoing basis to the Office of Financial Management, it is not expected that a substantial additional reporting burden would be required in order to submit similar (or identical) data to the HECB, or to supplement it with outcomes data (e.g., grades and degrees). If this proves to be an incorrect assumption, cost estimates will be adjusted.

## **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- In June 2004, a Data Advisory Group, required under House Bill 3103, was formed that includes representatives from various agencies, colleges, and universities. The group has reviewed the data each organization currently stores and links to other sources.
- In August 2004, the HECB requested funding for this initiative in its proposed 2005-07 operating budget.

## **2. Implement data links between four-year college data and other sources to conduct research for use in policy and improving programs. For example, links would enable the tracking and analysis of data regarding student academic performance and employment.**

- **By June 2006, the Data Advisory Group and HECB staff** will identify potential data linkages, develop a list of prioritized policy questions and research projects to be completed during the following two years, and revise or develop agreements for sharing, protecting, and accessing linked data.
- **By September 2006, HECB staff** will submit the list of prioritized projects to the board for approval. The Data Advisory Group will assist in developing protocols, standards, and routines for regularly linking data between agencies and schools. HECB staff will begin linking and testing the new data.
- **By December 2006, HECB staff, in consultation with the Data Advisory Group,** will develop a reporting schedule and user survey. The group will review and discuss any draft reports produced by the HECB staff and resolve any data problems.
- **By March 2007, HECB staff** will begin regularly producing reports using the linked data. Users will be surveyed. Other linkages will be explored. The list of prioritized projects will be revisited and adjusted as necessary. The Data Advisory Group will continue to meet on a quarterly basis to discuss user feedback, prioritize future projects, and resolve data problems.

## **Performance Measures**

- Once the database is fully developed, data will be published annually to help policy-makers and state residents evaluate the contribution of higher education to the educational, economic, and civic conditions of Washington State. Surveys will be issued to measure the usefulness of these reports.

## **Estimated Costs**

- No costs have been identified for the data-linking portion of this project. If costs prove to be greater than expected, they will be included in budget requests in future biennia.

## **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The Data Advisory Group convened in June 2004 and discussed potential data linkages. During the summer of 2004, HECB staff interviewed individual advisory group members, who advised HECB staff to begin by linking the four-year college data together and creating a data warehouse. The next step would involve linking the four-year college data to other data sources controlled by agencies such as the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the Department of Employment Security.

## **Reducing Barriers for Non-traditional Students**

### **Policy Proposal**

The state must pursue several strategies to meet the higher education needs of “non-traditional” students – a group that includes, but is not limited to, unemployed adults, students whose first language is not English, and those who need to balance college, work, and family obligations.

### **Recommended Actions**

#### **1. Assess and address the need for education and training programs among targeted non-traditional students.**

- **By spring 2005, the HECB and its partners** will identify specific groups of non-traditional students whose needs will be assessed and addressed in depth. Partners will include public and private colleges, universities and career schools, and state K-12, workforce training and higher education agencies. Partners will seek input from business and labor groups, industry associations, and selected organizations that represent targeted groups.
- **By fall 2005, the HECB and its partners** will assess the education and training needs of targeted groups and will strive to build upon the work of the partner organizations.
- **On an ongoing basis, the HECB and its partners** will use information from this and other related initiatives (such as the needs assessment called for in House Bill 3103) to advocate for new or expanded programs to serve non-traditional students.

### **Performance Measures**

- Completion of process to identify targeted groups for focused assessment and attention.
- Number of new or expanded programs for targeted groups of non-traditional students and number of targeted non-traditional students served by such programs.
- Improved participation rates and outcomes for targeted non-traditional students.

### **Estimated Costs**

- No new administrative costs are expected for the assessment. This work will be performed in conjunction with the needs assessment called for in House Bill 3103 or as part of other related HECB and institutional responsibilities.

- There will be costs associated with developing new or expanded programs, but the amounts will depend on the nature of the initiatives. Institutions may be expected to meet minor costs within their existing budgets, but additional appropriations would be required for large-scale projects.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board have assessed the educational needs of non-traditional students. These assessments will be resources in implementing this strategy.
- The HECB has begun developing the statewide needs assessment directed by House Bill 3103, which will include consideration of the needs of non-traditional students.
- Central Washington University's development of Bachelor of Applied Science degrees in Safety and Health Management and Industrial Technology is an example of new programs targeted to non-traditional students. These programs will serve students who have received job training in these fields but lack baccalaureate degrees. The HECB is reviewing these proposals for approval and the university plans to submit other similar degree proposals in the future.
- The state's community and technical colleges are expanding and developing new programs that combine job training and English as a Second Language instruction.

### **2. Publicize best practices to meet the education and training needs of non-traditional students.**

- **By December 2005, the HECB** and its partners will complete a review of best practices, building on relevant work already conducted.
- **By February 2006, the HECB** and its partners will decide which strategies and programs to promote for broader implementation and begin distributing information statewide.

### **Performance Measures**

- Extent of statewide communication of best practices.

### **Estimated Costs**

- No additional costs are expected.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- SBCTC and the Workforce Education Council have conducted studies of best practices in programs that serve mainly non-traditional students. These studies will be used in the review and identification of best practices.
- Heritage University has held nationally attended conferences focused on the issue of effectively breaking down barriers to participation of non-traditional students.

### **3. Strengthen the coordination of current efforts to provide education and training programs for non-traditional students.**

- **On an ongoing basis, the HECB** will work with its partners to coordinate efforts to address the needs of non-traditional students, including the approval of new degree programs at the public four-year universities; development of a statewide higher education needs assessment; and the authorization of out-of-state institutions to offer on-site instruction and degree programs in Washington.

### **Performance Measures**

- The number of approved new or enhanced programs that focus on non-traditional students and the number of non-traditional students served by such programs.

### **Estimated Costs**

- No additional costs are expected for coordination activities, although new or expanded programs generally result in additional costs to the institutions.

### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The HECB authorizes out-of-state and some in-state institutions to provide baccalaureate and advanced degree programs, many of which address the needs of non-traditional students. The board also reviews and approves new programs at public four-year institutions. New programs, especially those at the research universities' branch campuses and at the comprehensive universities' off-campus learning centers, frequently are designed to meet non-traditional students' needs.
- Community and technical colleges focus on non-traditional students. New programs in the two-year college system are subject to the approval of the SBCTC.
- Private colleges and universities have developed a variety of programs focusing on non-traditional students. For example, Gonzaga University has an extensive distance education program, Seattle Pacific University and Whitworth College offer "upside

down” degrees, and St. Martin’s College offers flexible scheduling and extensive internships. However, this information is not systematically reported to the HECB or other state agencies, therefore procedures to transmit such information will be essential to assure effective coordination of these programs.

#### **4. Support and promote financial aid policies and programs targeted to non-traditional students.**

- **The HECB** is requesting \$2 million in the 2005-07 state operating budget for a pilot project to develop a financial aid program to assist adult students who work full-time while attending college part-time. (**Note:** This strategy is addressed in detail in the implementation plan for the board’s financial aid policy proposal.)
- **During the 2004-05 academic year, the HECB** will gather input from the financial aid community to determine whether non-traditional students should be specifically identified for priority assistance through the board’s Future Teacher Conditional Scholarship and Loan Repayment program. (**Note:** Bilingual instruction is already identified as a priority in this program.)

#### **Performance Measures**

- The number of students served through the financial aid program for working adults (pending project approval and funding in the 2005-07 state operating budget).

#### **Estimated Costs**

- The HECB has requested \$2 million in 2005-07 for the pilot financial aid program.

#### **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- The HECB is developing rules for the revisions to the Future Teachers Conditional Scholarship and Loan Repayment Program that were enacted in 2004 by the governor and legislature in House Bill 2708.

#### **5. Increase the number of current or new college instructors who are trained to teach adults, particularly those who require English language or bilingual instruction, or are participating in English as a Second Language programs.**

- **By fall 2005, the HECB and higher education partners** will collaborate to identify and publicize grant programs through which funding is available to provide relevant instruction and training.

## **Performance Measures**

- The number of new or continuing grants to provide training in teaching adult learners and ESL and, as a result, the number of newly trained instructors.

## **Estimated Costs**

- Administrative work on this initiative would be absorbed within existing budgets.
- The state would incur no additional costs if this initiative took advantage of existing grant funds, such as high-demand enrollment funding for teacher training or certification.

## **Examples of Ongoing Work Related to this Recommended Action**

- In the past two years, the HECB has awarded several high-demand enrollment grants to universities for programs to serve non-traditional students. Examples include the CWU “career switcher” program to retrain laid-off aerospace workers as math teachers and programs at two universities (CWU and WSU) to increase the number of teachers trained to provide ESL instruction.
- The HECB has awarded federal Title IIA teacher training grants to enable colleges of education to prepare better-trained ESL and bilingual teachers. For example, Heritage University is using a grant to prepare experienced teachers’ aides to become fully certified ESL and bilingual teachers.
- The Washington Professional Educator Standards Board oversees state and federal grant programs to develop “alternative route” programs to increase the number of teachers in geographic and subject-matter shortage areas, including ESL and bilingual instruction.